

REMARKS

In view of the preceding amendments and the comments which follow, and pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, amendment and reconsideration of the Office Action dated March 1, 2006, is respectfully requested by Applicant.

Summary

Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

Claim 2 has been cancelled. The features of Claim 2 have been incorporated into Claim 1 for a non-substantive reason. This amendment is not directly related to overcoming the novelty and non-obviousness rejections set forth in the previous Office Action.

Minor changes have been made to the claim language of Claim 1. These minor amendments are not related to overcoming the rejections set forth in the previous Office Action.

Interview Summary

On February 23, 2006, the Examiner informed the Applicant's Agent, Anthony Curtis, via a telephonic interview, that he would resend the Office Action that was mistakenly sent to the wrong address. Applicants thank the Examiner for his cooperation in expediently correcting the error.

Drawings

Textual labels have been added, as requested by the Examiner, to Figure 1. Please find a "Replacement Sheet" of Figure 1 attached hereto.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uppunda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,728; "Uppunda"). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppunda in view of Wikipedia -> USB.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a first buffer memory that stores data to be sent to the host computer and a second buffer memory that stores data outputted from the

peripheral device. In the arrangement of Claim 1, because the first buffer memory stores data that is to be sent to the host computer, the first buffer memory must be connected to the side of a host either through a logical connection or a physical connection. Because the second buffer memory stores data outputted from the peripheral device, the second memory buffer must be connected to the side of a peripheral device either through a logical connection or a physical connection.

Claim 1 also recites, inter alia, a control unit that transfers the data stored in the second buffer memory to the first buffer memory, when receiving a transmission approval command of approving data transmission from the peripheral device to the host computer.

Uppunda fails to disclose the arrangement of Claim 1. Uppunda fails to disclose the receive FIFO 206 connected to the side of a peripheral device and the transmit FIFO 208 connected to the side of a host. In fact, Uppunda discloses an arrangement where receive FIFO 206 and transmit FIFO 208 are both connected directly to a network (Figure 4). Accordingly, the hardware configuration between Claim 1 and Uppunda is different and Uppunda fails to disclose the arrangement of Claim 1.

In addition, Uppunda fails to teach or suggest transferring the data of the receive FIFO 206 to the transmit FIFO 208, as recited in Claim 1. More specifically, Uppunda fails to disclose transferring the received data to the side of a PCI bus 118 via a transmit FIFO 208 when the data coming from the network 120 is received at the receive FIFO 206. Accordingly, the arrangement of Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art because Uppunda fails to disclose all of the limitations of Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 3 and 4 depend on Claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seek an early allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200